



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,355	03/22/2002	Paul David James Blackler	P32286	1395

20462 7590 01/31/2005

SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY-US, UW2220
P. O. BOX 1539
KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939

EXAMINER

MORRIS, PATRICIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/019,355	Applicant(s) BLACKLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Patricia L. Morris	Art Unit 1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 26-37 are under consideration in this application.

Specification

The specification fails to give a Brief Description of the Several Views of the

Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 26-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Again, there is also a lack of description as to whether the pharmaceutical carriers are able to maintain the compound in the polymorphic form or solvates claimed. Desolvation may occur. Note page 290 of Brittain. Processing a compound into a pharmaceutical composition could desolvate or create a different polymorph than the polymorphs being claims or even back to the compound itself. See pages 912-913 of Habeblian.

Art Unit: 1625

Again, the specification fails to describe the pharmaceutical compositions claimed in terms of their X-ray diffraction pattern or infrared spectrum data. The X-ray diffraction and Infrared spectrum data in the specification only pertains to the compounds rather than the compositions being claimed. Applicants request clarification. It is unclear whether or not the hydrate is actually maintained in the composition and now in the tablet or capsule and whether or not the compound in the composition actually treats diabetes mellitus and any unknown condition associated with diabetes mellitus. Applicants have failed to show whether or not the polymorph and not the original compound treats diabetes and all the conditions associated with diabetes.

Chemical & Engineering News discloses that formulation of drugs or pharmaceuticals in its metastable forms, for example, one polymorph, is highly unpredictable. The metastable forms will disappear and change into the most thermodynamically stable form. The specification lacks description of how the pharmaceutical composition can be prepared in order to maintain the particular compound of a particular form with the particular infrared spectra and X-ray diffraction being claimed. Disclosure of X-ray diffraction patterns for pharmaceutical compositions comprising the polymorphic forms are lacking in the specification. The X-ray diffraction patterns and infrared spectra on pages 8-9 and the referenced figure 1 only supports the polymorphic forms of the compounds and not the pharmaceutical compositions.

Contra to applicants's arguments in the instant response, the specification has not described how the polymorph forms and compositions being claimed will be maintained and prevented from converting to other forms when used in the treatment of diabetes mellitus and all unknown conditions and complications whatever they may be.

Art Unit: 1625

The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. Applicants are referred to In re Fouche, 169 USPQ 429 CCPA 1971, MPEP 716.02(b).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The nature of the invention

The nature of the invention is the preparation of novel polymorphic forms of the instant salt and compositions and for treating diabetes mellitus and any and all unknown conditions associated with diabetes mellitus.

State of the Prior Art

Polymorphs arise when molecules of a compound stack in the solid state in distinct ways. (See Chemical Engineering News, page 32). Although identical in chemical composition, polymorphs can have very different properties. They are distinguishable by various analytical techniques, especially X-ray powder diffraction. Additionally, solids may form solvates. Polymorphs tend to convert from less stable to more stable forms. (See Chemical Engineering News, page 32). No method exists to predict the polymorphs of a solid compound with any

Art Unit: 1625

significant certainty. In drug design, it is best work with the most stable polymorph, because it will not covert any further, however, the most stable polymorph usually is the least soluble. To improve bioavailability, drug companies sometimes trade off polymorph stability with solubility, choosing to work instead with the less stable forms first, also known as the metastable forms.

Polymorphs can convert from one form to another during the manufacturing process of a pharmaceutical drug. See Chemical Engineering News. Page 33, which will changed the pharmacological affects of the drug. This is why it is important to monitor the polymorph during manufacture of the drug to see if it persists during manufacture.

Contra to applicants' arguments in the instant response, there is no evidence in the specification whether the instant compound, composition, tablets or capsules containing the instant compound treats diabetes, all the conditions and complications associated with diabetes.

The amount of direction or guidance and the presence or absence of working examples

Figures 1-4 and pages 9-10 of the specification only disclose the X-ray diffraction pattern and infrared spectra of compounds of particular forms rather than the compositions being claimed in terms of the specific X-ray diffraction patterns. Polymorphs often change into other polymorphs during drug manufacture (See Chemical Engineering News) into a pharmaceutical composition. Based on the unpredictability in the art, the applicant is not entitled to the X-ray diffraction patterns claimed for the pharmaceutical compositions.

Further, the specification fails to show that the instant polymorphs treat diabetes and moreover all the unknown conditions associated with diabetes. As evidenced by the art of record, it is well known that polymorphs can convert to the original compound. Applicants have

Art Unit: 1625

failed to show any unexpected or unobvious properties of the claimed polymorph *vis-à-vis* the original compound.

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims are drawn to the specific polymorph form in addition to the pharmaceutical compositions and the method of treating diabetes mellitus, conditions associated with diabetes mellitus and complications thereof.

The quantity of experimentation needed

The quantity of experimentation needed would be undue when faced with the lack of direction and guidance present in the instant specification in regards to the pharmaceuticals compositions being claimed and verifying that they have the specific X-ray diffraction patterns being claimed which are not disclosed in the specification. There is also lack of guidance as to whether the instant polymorph rather than the original compound treat diabetes mellitus and any of the unknown conditions and complications thereof.

In terms of the 8 Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of unpredictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by applicants. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The expression “substantially in accordance” in claims 28-30 is indefinite to its meaning. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations.

Claims 28 and 30 are incomplete because the claims are not self-contained in particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming what applicants regard as their invention. This practice facilitates examination of the claimed invention by having the subject matter all in one place, avoids complicating the examination process by adding the processing of drawings and possible correction thereof, and permits the claimed subject matter to be easily modified without possible correction of drawings and potential modification of the scope of the disclosure as originally filed. Further, the public should not have to refer to the claimed subject matter in one place and not have to refer back and forth to at least two or three different places.

The claims measure the invention. United Carbon Co. V. Binney & Smith Co., 55 USPQ 381 at 384, col. 1, end of 1st paragraph, Supreme Court of the United States (1942).

The U.S. Court of Claims held to this standard in *Lockheed Aircraft Corp. v. United States*, 193 USPQ 449, “Claims measure invention and resolution of invention must be based on what is claimed”.

The C.C.P.A. in 1978 held that invention is the subject matter defined by the claims submitted by the applicant. We have consistently held that no applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim”: In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, at 15.

Art Unit: 1625

Conclusion


No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Patricia L. Morris
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625

plm
January 27, 2005